



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,889	04/01/2005	Hansjorg Eibl	2923-700	7742
6449	7590	08/21/2008		
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1425 K STREET, N.W.			JAVANMARD, SAHAR	
SUITE 800				ART UNIT
WASHINGTON, DC 20005				PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/21/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/529,889	EIBL, HANSJORG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SAHAR JAVANMARD	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4 and 7-12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 2,3,5 and 6 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/1/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Restriction Requirement remarks filed on April 22, 2008. Claim(s) 1-12 are pending. Applicant's election of species of R_1 = diacyl glycerol, R_2 =choline, R_3 =glycerol without traverse of the restriction requirement in the reply is acknowledged. Examiner found elected species free of the art and therefore the search was expanded. Claims 1-12 were examined in their entirety as they read on the elected invention, therefore the species election requirement is hereby withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

The following documents were not available to the examiner at the time of examination: Documents listed on the Information Disclosure Statement filed 4/1/2005, under Foreign Patent Documents and Non-Patent Literature: crossed references are not available and therefore information referred to therein has not been considered.

Applicants may, in response to this and no later Office Action, submit the missing references. Such submissions will be considered to have been part of the respective Information Disclosure Statement filed on 4/1/2005, and the PTO-1449 will be updated accordingly. No fee for the submission of such references is required, nor should applicants file an additional form PTO-1449 with the missing references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention, in the instant case producing a medicament or the treatment of cancer.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to fully practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547, the court recited eight factors:

(1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

(1). The Nature of the Invention:

All of the rejected claims are drawn to an invention which pertains to producing a

medicament of or the treatment of cancer. The nature of the invention is complex in that it encompasses the treatment of all types of cancers.

(2). Breadth of the Claims:

The complex nature of the subject matter of this invention is greatly exacerbated by the breadth of the claims. The claims encompass inhibition of any number of cancers by a compound of formula I.

(3). Guidance of the Specification:

There is no guidance in the specification as to how one would treat any kind of cancer, let alone “cancer” in general.

(4). Working Examples:

There are no working examples.

(5). State of the Art.

While the state of the art is relatively high with regard to treating specific cancers, the state of the art with regard to treating cancer, generally, is underdeveloped. In particular, there is no known anticancer agent that is effective against all cancers. Carter, et al. (Chemotherapy of Cancer, 2nd ed., 1981) clearly teaches that for the forty known anticancer agents, none are effective against all cancers (pages 362-365). There are compounds that treat a range of cancers, but no one has ever been able to figure

out how to get a compound to be effective against cancer generally, or even a majority of cancers. Thus, the existence of such a "silver bullet" is contrary to our present understanding in oncology. This is true in part because cancers arise from a wide variety of sources, such as viruses (e.g. EBV, HHV-8, and HTLV-1), exposure to chemicals such as tobacco tars, genetic disorders, ionizing radiation, and a wide variety of failures of the body's cell growth regulatory mechanisms. Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body, and different vulnerabilities. Even those that affect a single organ are often not generally treatable. For example, the main types of lung cancer are small cell (oat cell), giant cell, clear cell, adenocarcinoma of the lung, squamous cell cancer of the lung, and mesothelioma. There is no such thing as a treatment of these generally because of their diversity. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally, evidence that the level of skill in this art is low relative to the difficulty of such a task.

(6). Predictability of the Art.

The invention is directed to treating cancer cells in general. It is well established that "the scope of enablement various inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved," and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839 (1970). Cancers are especially unpredictable due to their complex nature. Please refer to the discussion of Carter, et al. and the state of the art in (5) that shows the different

treatments of cancers. The treatment of one type of cancer could not be necessarily the same for the other type.

(7). The Quantity of Experimentation Necessary.

In order to practice the claimed invention, one of skill in the art would have to first envision a combination of an appropriate pharmaceutical carrier, a dosage for each compound, the duration of treatment, route of treatment, etc. and, in the case of human treatment, an appropriate animal model system for one of the claimed compounds. One would then need to test the combination in the model system to determine whether or not the combination is effective for inhibiting cancer cells. If unsuccessful, which is likely given the lack of significant guidance from the specification or prior art regarding treatment of cancer with any compound, one of skill in the art would have to then either envision a modification of the first combination of pharmaceutical compound, compound dosage, duration of treatment, route of administration, etc. and appropriate animal model system, or envision an entirely new combination of the above and test the system again. If again unsuccessful, which is likely given the lack of significant guidance from the specification or prior art regarding treatment of cancer with any compound, the entire, unpredictable process would have to be repeated until successful. In order to practice Applicant's invention, it would be necessary for one to conduct the preceding experimentation for each type of cancer because, as described by Carter, et al., there is no known drug effective for inhibiting all types of cancer. Therefore, it would require undue, unpredictable experimentation to practice the claimed invention to inhibit cancer

cells in a mammal by administration of one of the compounds within the claims. Genetech, 108 F.3d at 1366 states that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable." Therefore, a method for inhibiting cancer cells, generally, by administering the various compounds of formula I of the claims is not considered to be enabled by the instant specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10 and 12 provides for the use of "a liposome", but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App.

1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 7-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ashley (US Patent No. 5,855,910).

For the sake of advancing prosecution, Examiner has interpreted the “use” claims as product claims. In as such, no patentable weight is given for the “intended use” of the pharmaceutical composition containing “a liposome” as recited in claims 10 and 12. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Ashley teaches Applicant’s compound of formula I where in R^1 =diacylglycerol R^2 =choline (column 7, lines 45-55) and $R^3=C_1-C_{24}$ straight chain alkyl or alkenyl (column 7, lines 45-65), meeting the limitations of claim 1.

Furthermore, Ashley teaches that these phospholipids can be obtained from the parent phosphoglyceride (column 7, lines 10-36), meeting the limitations of claim 7.

Ashley teaches a class of cationic phospholipids, and the synthesis thereof, that are capable of generating liposomes (column 4, lines 66-67), meeting the limitations of claim 8, 10, and 12.

The liposomes are taught as methods of treatment of diseases or ailments amenable to treatment with nucleic acids or oligonucleotides (column 6, lines 39-45), meeting the limitations of claim 9 and 11

Claim 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bruzik et al. (*Journal of Organic Chemistry*, 1986).

Bruzik teaches the synthesis of glycerophospholipids, namely Applicant's phospholipid for formula wherein R^1 =diacylglycerol, R^2 =glycerol and R^3 =Me (page 2369, compound 5), meeting the limitations of claims 1 and 4.

Conclusion

Claims 1-12 are not allowed.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sahar Javanmard whose telephone number is (571) 270-3280. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM-5 PM MON-FRI (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/S. J./

Examiner, Art Unit 1617

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617

Application/Control Number: 10/529,889
Art Unit: 1617

Page 11